

REMARKS:

Appellant has amended the claims to more accurately define Applicant's invention. The claims have been amended to further define the differences between the current invention and US 3,299,199 to Mattingly relied on by the Examiner. Particularly, the current invention is based on the concept of a modular card rack that offers more flexibility in use. More specifically, the card rack of the present invention uses a module that may be secured to a surface in two ways depending on the conditions at the work site.

The terminal box of US 3,299,199 to Mattingly may be secured to a surface in only one way. Mattingly teaches that the end members are aligned with the base wall 12 so that the base wall 12 contacts the surface to which the terminal box is to be attached. This contrasts with the present invention that gives the user a choice. The module of the present invention may be secured to the surface so that the base is generally parallel to the surface to which the device is to be secured. Alternatively, the module of the present invention may be secured to the surface in a manner that the base of the module is generally perpendicular to the surface. There is no teaching or suggestion of this feature in the Mattingly patent. Thus, there is no suggestion in Mattingly of the following feature of Applicant's invention:

“wherein said first and second flanges provide a means of attachment to a surface such that said base is generally parallel to said surface and wherein said third and fourth flanges provide a second means of attachment on a surface wherein said base is generally perpendicular to said surface”

Furthermore, Mattingly does not teach or suggest the flange arrangement that provides Applicant's invention with the ability to have multiple arrangements on a surface. There is only one pair of flanges in Mattingly. These flanges are in line with the base wall 12. Applicant, on the other hand has two pairs of flanges. There is the first pair that are parallel to the base and the second pair that are perpendicular to the base and the other flanges.

The other patents relied on by the Examiner do not overcome the deficiencies in the Mattingly reference. Nguyen is directed to a panel mounted power cord set and is concerned with the positioning of power cords. Johnson is directed to a wall anchor and not a module for use in a card rack.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons Applicant requests reconsideration and allowanve of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas A. O'Rourke
Reg. No. 27,665
Bodner & O'Rourke
425 Broadhollow Road
Melville, New York 11747
631-249-7500

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicant is submitting seven sheets of formal drawings as replacement sheets for the drawings originally submitted. These drawings have the reference numerals 45A and 46A.